

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-9, 11, and 12 remain in the application and claim 1 has been amended hereby. Claims 2-4 and 10 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 6, 7, and 11 under 35 USC 102(b), as being anticipated by Ejima et al. '219.

Features of the present invention are a holder operating mechanism (35 in Fig. 8) for moving a memory member (4 in Fig. 8) loaded in a memory holder (30 in Fig. 8) from a housing position (a<sub>2</sub> in Fig. 8) to a loading/unloading position (a<sub>1</sub> in Fig. 8), wherein the memory holder includes a locking mechanism (36 in Fig. 8) for maintaining an electrical contact between the memory member and a terminal section (25 in Fig. 8) when the memory holder is moved from the housing position to the loading/unloading position, and when pressure is applied to the locking mechanism the electrical contact is disconnected. See the first full paragraph of page 13 and page 14, line 17 to page 15, line 12 of the present application, for example.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to emphasize these features of the present invention.

Looking at Ejima et al. '219 we see that there is no locking mechanism to keep an electrical contact between the memory member and the terminal section in the

loading/unloading position until pressure is applied to the locking mechanism. See Figs. 6 and 7 of Ejima et al. '219, for example.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 1, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentably distinct over Ejima et al. '219.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 3, 4, 10, and 12 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Ejima et al. '219 in view of Matsuo.

Claims 3, 4, and 10 have been canceled, thereby rendering the rejection thereof moot.

Claim 12 depends from claim 1 which rejection over Ejima et al. '219 has been addressed above and, because there are no features in Matsuo that somehow could be combined with Ejima et al. '219 and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that claim 12 is patentably distinct over Ejima et al. '219 in view of Matuso.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 5 and 8 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Ejima et al. '219 in view of Hikishima.

Claims 5 and 8 depend from claim 1 which rejection over Ejima et al. '219 has been addressed above and, because there are no features in Hikishima that somehow could be combined with Ejima et al. '219 and result in the presently claimed

invention, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5 and 8 are patentably distinct over Ejima et al. '219 in view of Hikishima.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 9 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Ejima et al. '219 in view of Hikishima and Matsuo.

Claim 9 depends from claim 1 which rejection over Ejima et al. '219 has been addressed above and, because there are no features in Hikishima and Matsuo that somehow could be combined with Ejima et al. '219 and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that claim 9 is patentably distinct over Ejima et al. '219 in view of Hikishima and Matsuo.

Entry of this amendment is earnestly solicited, and it is respectfully submitted that the amendments made to the claims hereby raise no new issues requiring further consideration and/or search, because all of the features of this invention have clearly been considered by the examiner in the prosecution of this application and because the present amendments serve only to further define and emphasize the novel features of this invention.

7217/60612

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

COOPER & DUNHAM LLP



Jay M. Maioli  
Reg. No. 27, 213

JHM/PCF:tb